

REMARKS

The Office Action mailed December 23, 2009 has been reviewed and reconsideration of the above-identified application in view of the following amendments and remarks is respectfully requested

Claims 1-11 are pending.

Claims 1-11 stand rejected.

Claims 1, 9, 10 and 11 are independent claims.

Claims 1, 2, 6, 7 and 9 have been amended.

The ABSTRACT of the Specification is objected to. The Specification is objected to for failing to include header information. The drawings are objected to for not including the legend "Prior Art." Claims 1-11 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cok (USPPA 2004/0150590) (Cok 1). Claims 1-11 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cok (USPPA 2006/0077135) (Cok 2).

With regard to the objection to the ABSTRACT, applicant respectfully disagrees with and explicitly traverses the objection.

Correcting video data signals is claimed in claim 1, wherein an X value for each transistor is stored (step (i)) and after calculating an X value (step (vii)), replacing the stored X value with the calculated (i.e., corrected) X value (step (viii)).

Accordingly, applicant believes that the ABSTRACT provides an appropriate recitation of the invention claimed and no amendment is necessary.

However, applicant has noticed that the ABSTRACT appears to have grammatical errors that does not convey the accurately the underlying principles of the invention claimed. Further, the ABSTRACT includes the term "[FIG. 3]."

Accordingly, applicant has amended the ABSTRACT to correct the grammatical error and to remove this term.

For the amendments made to the ABSTRACT and for the remarks made herein, applicant submits that the reason for the objection has been overcome.

With regard to the objection to the specification for lacking section headings, Applicant respectfully submits that 37 CFR §1.77(b) discloses a *suggested* format for the arrangement of the disclosure. Applicant respectfully submits that the present disclosure follows the suggested format where applicable. With regard to 37 CFR §1.77(c), which was not cited in the Office Action, Applicant respectfully submits that section headings are suggested but not required, as 37 CFR §1.77(c) clearly states the sections defined in paragraphs (b) (1) through (b) (11) "should" be preceded by a section heading. Applicant respectfully declines to amend the disclosure to include the suggested headings at this time.

Applicant thanks the examiner for his observation regarding Figures 1 and 2 and has provided amended Figures 1 and 2, on a single sheet, to contain the label "Prior Art." Furthermore, the sheet upon which Figures 1 and 2 are contained has been appropriately labeled "Replacement Sheets." No new matter has been added.

For the submission of amended Figures 1 and 2, applicant submits that the objection to the drawings has been overcome.

With regard to the rejection of claims 1-11 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cok (USPPA 2004/0150590) (Cok 1) and the rejection of claims 1-11 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cok (USPPA 2006/0077135) (Cok 2), applicant respectfully disagrees with and explicitly traverses the reason for the rejection.

Cok1 discloses a method of determining and applying a correction factor to data signals that are applied an OLED display. Cok1 illustrates in Figure 1 the process of determining a correction factor based on a "given signal" (see steps 30-34), applying a data signal to the display, forming a correction value and applying the correction signal (see steps 38-42). When a re-calibration is desired, the "given signal" is again applied to the display and a new correction factor is determined (see steps 46-54).

Thus, Cok1 determines a correction value based on a given signal, which is a calibration signal that is the same whether there is an initial calibration or a re-calibration. However, Cok1 fails to teach that the "given signal" is comparable to the video data signal, as is recited in the claims. ("...receiving a set of video data signals, each having a value v_d ; (iii) – determining from the stored X values and the received v_d values an expected current through...").

That is, the given or calibration signal disclosed by Cok1 not comparable to the data signals recited in the claims.

In addition, Cok1 fails to disclose updating the correction value after each display, as is recited in the claims. Rather Cok1 teaches that when recalibration is desired, then the "given signal" is again applied to the display. Thus, even if it could be said that recalibration is performed after each display update, the correction value is determined based on a "given signal" and not based on the data signal as is recited in the claims.

Hence, Cok1 fails to disclose a material element recited in each of the independent claims.

Cok2 discloses a process similar to that of Cok1, wherein first and second measurements are taken with regard to known drive signals (steps 100-110). However, similar to Cok1, Cok2 fails to disclose that the "known signal" is comparable to the data signal, as is recited in the claims. ("...receiving a set of video data signals, each having a value v_d ; (iii) – determining from the stored X values and the received v_d values an expected current through...")

Hence, Cok2 also fails to disclose a material element recited in each of the independent claims.

A claimed invention is prima facie obvious when three basic criteria are met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the reference themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine the teachings therein. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. And, third, the prior art reference or combined references must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. The Court in KSR v. Teleflex (citation omitted) has held that the teaching, suggestion and motivation test (TSM) is merely to be used as a helpful hint in determining obviousness and a bright light application of such a test is adverse to those factors for determining obviousness enumerated in Graham v. John Deere (i.e., the scope and content of the prior art, the level of ordinary skill in the art, the differences between the claimed invention and the prior art and objective indicia of non-obviousness) (citation omitted).

In this case, the cited references (Cok1, Cok2) fail to provide any teaching regarding determining a correction signal based on the video data signal, as is recited in the claims. Hence, neither of the cited references teaches all the elements recited in the claims.

Applicant submits that for the remarks made, herein, the independent claims includes subject matter that is not taught by the cited references, alone or in combination and, hence, are not rendered unpatentable over the cited references.

With regard to the remaining claims, each of these claims depends from a corresponding one of the independent claims and, hence, each of the remaining

claims is also patentable over the cited references by virtue of their dependency upon an allowable base claim.

For the amendments made to the claims and for the remarks made herein, applicant submits that the reason for the rejection has been overcome and respectfully requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

Applicant respectfully requests that a Notice of Allowance be issued.

Applicant denies any statement, position or averment stated in the Office Action that is not specifically addressed by the foregoing. Any rejection and/or points of argument not addressed are moot in view of the presented arguments and no arguments are waived and none of the statements and/or assertions made in the Office Action is conceded.

Applicant makes no statement regarding the patentability of the subject matter recited in the claims prior to this Amendment and has amended the claims solely to facilitate expeditious prosecution of this patent application. Applicant respectfully reserves the right to pursue claims, including the subject matter encompassed by the originally filed claims, as presented prior to this Amendment, and any additional claims in one or more continuing applications during the pendency of the instant application.

In the event the Examiner deems personal contact desirable in the disposition of this case, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at the telephone given below.

No fees are believed necessary for the timely filing of this paper.

Respectfully submitted,
Michael E. Belk, Reg.No. 33357

Date: March 12, 2010

/Carl A. Giordano/
By: Carl A. Giordano
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 41,780

Mail all correspondence to:
Michael E. Belk, Esq.
US PHILIPS CORPORATION
P.O. Box 3001
Briarcliff Manor, NY 10510-8001
Phone: (914) 333-9643
Fax: (914) 332-0615

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING UNDER 37 C.F.R. §1.8(a)

The undersigned hereby certifies that this document is being
☐ Electronically transmitted utilizing the currently available EFS;
☐ Transmitted by facsimile to 571 273 8300;
☐ Placed with the US Postal Service with First Class postage attached to the address indicated above;
on March _____, 2010.

.....
Print Name

.....
Signature